

CITY COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, March 1, 2011

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Mayor Osborne called the regular March 1, 2011 council meeting to order at 6:06 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Those present were: Mayor Osborne, Deputy Mayor Wilson and Council Members Ageton, Appelbaum, Becker, Cowles, Gray, Karakehian and Morzel.

A. STATE OF THE COURT REPORT. – 6:07 P.M.

Municipal Court Judge Linda Cooke provided a State of the Court report that focused on homelessness and alcohol issues. She described the types of homeless persons she encountered on a frequent basis to illustrate how diverse the population was. She then described current alcohol initiatives. New monitors were being used in the courtroom to illustrate important aspects of minors in possession cases. MIP collaborations included a screening tool, additional program development between CU and the Public Health Department and a focus on student conduct hearings at CU. AACT was a campus/community coalition that began in January 2010 which focused on environmental management strategies to address high risk alcohol consumption. Some environmental contributors included lack of substance free options, alcohol availability and marketing among others. She concluded that the environmental strategies appeared to be effective in reducing the incidence and likelihood of intoxication. Judge Cooke would be speaking at the International Town & Gown Association at its annual conference in Boulder, May 31 – June 3 and urged Council Members to attend.

Council Member Morzel asked about legal representation for homeless persons. Judge Cooke commented that some homeless persons choose to represent themselves or they are referred to the legal aid program. There are also local attorneys that volunteer to represent them. Judge Cooke also clarified that the court rarely saw homeless persons under 18 years of age and there was a small number of 18-30 year olds that are seen in the court.

Mayor Osborne then reminded the public that applications were still being accepted through 5 p.m. Friday, March 4 for the HRC, Landmarks and Parks and Recreation Advisory Boards.

2. OPEN COMMENT COUNCIL/STAFF RESPONSE – 6:34 p.m.

1. Stacey Balcom from Lafayette provided Council a notice of claim for the Boulder Arts Festival.
2. Seth Brigham read a poem about dignity related to homelessness.
3. David Harrison, an attorney who represents homeless persons for free, applauded Judge Cooke for putting a human face on the homeless in the community. He provided statistics that 30 cases had been handled related to homeless camping, 23 of which were resolved. 74% were dismissed either by the prosecution for lack of evidence and the others were dismissed with a not guilty verdict. The community discussions were that the ordinance was silly, inappropriate and an embarrassment. He urged council to repeal its camping ordinance.

4. Rob Smoke supported the previous speakers' comments noting that the camping ordinance was just a tool for the police to harass people. He asked Council and the Judge to remedy the lack of accountability to the community, particularly concerning individuals cleaning up after their dogs.
5. Alan Segal, co-chair of Friends of the Pottery Lab, requested more engagement from City staff related to privatizing the pottery lab. He spoke to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Board's support of forming a task force to address pottery lab issues but Parks & Recreation staff insisted on moving forward with a consultant.
6. Ann Fontenot continued Mr. Segal's comments indicating that utilizing a consultant would not ensure trust or that all stakeholders would be represented. FOPL was extremely disappointed with the Parks and Recreation staff approach.
7. James Lackey, 30 year Boulder resident and active hiker and biker, commented that it was totally reasonable for shared trails and corridors to exist in open space areas. He hoped Council would choose to support bike access in the West TSA.
8. Gary Sprung represented a modest approach to mountain biking/cyclists on trails and agreed some trails should remain hiking only. An article he published in the Boulder Blue Line last fall was handed out to council. He asked council to consider the implications of the environmental arguments put forth.
9. Carolyn Brniski with the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center presented an article published in the Colorado Daily on January 20 and spoke to the costs of prosecuting the camping ordinance cases. She asked the city to look at the economics of prosecuting people and where those funds could be better spent.
10. Jiah Kim asked what the basic, underlying logic of the camping ordinance was because she couldn't make logical sense of it. She felt council was protecting property values over human rights.
11. Ryan Schutz, a trail specialist with the International Mountain Biking Association, spoke to the West TSA noting that council had a chance to engage a new constituency and accept mountain bikers in its plans.
12. Tony Gannaway with Sue DeRose provided a handout petition and urged Council not to rubber stamp the Open Space Board proposal but to engage in a conversation about the bigger picture.
13. Mark McIntyre who recently served as a representative to the CCG for the mountain bike community, did not feel he was speaking to a consensus plan. The root cause was the voting and veto role the OSMP staff played in the CCG process. He asked council to look beyond the OSMP recommendation.

City Manager Response: - 7:10 p.m.

City Manager Brautigam spoke to the pottery lab issue noting she had directed staff to do a management analysis and to engage the public. On January 12 there was a facilitated meeting with the public. She had made the decision to obtain private consultant services as she felt staff would be subject to criticism. In addition, the current work plan did not allow for additional staff resources to be utilized for the purpose of convening a task force. An RFP did include the requirement for a program analysis. Parks and Recreation staff had already worked to double youth programs at the pottery lab for the summer.

City Attorney Response:

City Attorney Carr clarified that the statistics provided for camping tickets weren't entirely accurate. In 2009 and 2010, 800 some tickets were issued. In 2010, 75 of those were dismissed the majority of which were part of a plea bargain.

City Council Response:

Council Member Gray had attended the January pottery lab meeting and asked what was done with that information. City Manager Brautigam indicated the notes from that meeting were presented to PRAB and would be passed along to whichever consultant was chosen to do the management assessment.

Council Member Morzel asked what the ballpark cost would be to hire the consultant for the pottery lab. City Manager Brautigam commented that ballpark cost would be \$12-15,000. She clarified that the jury trials for the camping tickets were occurring on the first and third Thursdays and tapes were also available if Council Members contacted the City Attorney.

Deputy Mayor Wilson commented that winter camping was not safe and was a public safety issue that had not been addressed.

Council Member Ageton noted that Mr. Harrison's comments about jurors opinions regarding the camping ordinance were a bit one sided. She was called, and dismissed, for jury duty and had heard many varying comments among the potential jurors.

Mayor Osborne asked that staff keep Council informed about the pottery lab issue.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA: - 7:23 p.m.**

A. **CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 1, 2011 CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES.**

B. **CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO APPROVE THE COUNCIL RETREAT AND PRE-RETREAT SUMMARY FROM JANUARY 11, 21 AND 22, 2011.**

City Clerk Lewis asked Council to amend the item and only approve the pre-retreat Study Session from January 11. The full retreat summary would be brought back with the complete work plan and revised goals.

Council Member Becker indicated she had a small change to the Retreat Summary and would forward that to the City Clerk.

C. **CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO AUTHORIZE THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE DOCUMENTS FOR THE MUTUAL RELEASE OF THE OBLIGATIONS OF AN IMPACT FEE AGREEMENT OF DECEMBER 29, 1994, BETWEEN THE CITY AND BOULDER WOODLANDS L.P.**

D. **CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF A LEASE WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT FOR USE OF THE CITY'S GUNBARREL RADIO SITE.**

E. **CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION REGARDING LOGISTICS FOR THE MARCH 15, 2011 MEETING.**

F. **CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO APPROVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF**

BOULDER ("CITY") AND THE BOULDER VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT (BVSD) AND TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION FOR ACCEPTANCE OF GREAT OUTDOORS COLORADO (GOCO) GRANT FUNDS FOR A RENEWABLE ENERGY OUTDOOR CLASSROOM EDUCATION FACILITY.

- G. CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SIGN THE AGREEMENT FOR A GREAT OUTDOORS COLORADO (GOCO) LOCAL OUTDOOR RECREATION MINI-GRANT AND IF ACCEPTED, EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR THE DESIGN AND INSTALLATION OF NEW WAYFINDING AND SIGNAGE FOR THE VALMONT BIKE PARK.**
- H. CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO APPROVE THE PURPOSE, FRAMEWORK, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR BOULDER'S ENERGY FUTURE PROJECT.**
- I. INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING AND CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO ORDER PUBLISHED BY TITLE ONLY AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CABLE TELEVISION FRANCHISE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF BOULDER AND COMCAST OF COLORADO IV, LLC, TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE AGREEMENT BY TWO YEARS.**

Council Member Gray moved, seconded by Wilson to approve Consent Items 3A through 3I. The motion carried unanimously 9:0.

City Manager Brautigam commented that Council had before them some talking points and a PowerPoint presentation regarding Boulders Energy Future.

- 4. CALL- UP CHECK IN: - None**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. SECOND READING AND CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 7784 DESIGNATING THE BUILDING AND THE PROPERTY AT 550 COLLEGE AVENUE, TO BE KNOWN ALSO AS THE WILSON HOUSE, AS AN INDIVIDUAL LANDMARK UNDER THE CITY'S HISTORIC PRESERVATION CODE. THE HEARING ON THIS ITEM WILL BE HELD UNDER THE QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING PROCEDURES OF THE BOULDER REVISED CODE. OWNER/APPLICANT: VIOLA AND LINDA HAERTLING. -7:28 P.M.**

City Clerk Lewis swore in all participants in the hearing.

Ex-parte communications: - None

James Hewat provided the presentation on the history behind the house located at 550 College Avenue, to be known as the Wilson House. He showed various photos of the home and recommended Council approve the landmark designation.

There being no speakers the public hearing was closed.

Mayor Osborne moved, seconded by Gray to adopt Ordinance No. 7784 designating the building and the property at 550 College Avenue, to be known as the Wilson House, as an individual landmark under the City of Boulder Historic Preservation Code. The motion carried unanimously 9:0.

Council Member Becker offered a friendly amendment to rename the property to be known as the Wilson-Haertling House in Section 4 of the Ordinance. The friendly amendment was accepted.

B. SECOND READING AND CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO ADOPT ORDINANCE NO. 7783 AMENDING CHAPTERS 11-1, "WATER UTILITY," AND 4-20-25, "MONTHLY WATER USER CHARGES," B.R.C., 1981 RELATING TO DROUGHT RESPONSE. – 7:42 P.M.

Joanna Crean, Public Works Administrator provided the presentation on the item noting that Council would be asked to incorporate an updated drought plan, establish water budgets as a drought response measure, and add legislative intent language that emphasized avoiding water waste. The proposed changes would help separate the drought response measures from ongoing water conservation. The changes would also change the 1st violation to a warning. An outline of an approach to establishing the rules and regulations for drought response were included in the agenda memo as attachment B.

Deputy Mayor Wilson commented that the 2002 drought was one of the worst in the western U.S. When he was on the WRAB, comments were made that the community didn't want to know when or how to water but rather how much water they should use. This led to the water budget approach.

Council Member Appelbaum wondered if there was the option of a more drastic measure (i.e. shutting off someone's water) if a severe drought situation existed. This would be particularly important if someone had enough money to pay the higher rate fees and neglected to conserve. City Attorney Tom Carr indicated that the ordinance was written to allow for additional remedies if drought rules were being violated in Section 11-1-51 (b).

Council Member Cowles commented there were times when residents would blow their water budget due to leaks and asked if it would be possible for the utilities division to e-mail residents immediately in the first month when the water budget was exceeded. Ned Williams responded that staff did try to notify residents when they approached the upper tiers but didn't typically try to approach individuals who reach block three as that would be thousands of residents. In addition, the information was readily available online at the owners' initiative.

Deputy Mayor Wilson asked if staff had a way to develop a software based program that would recognize and notify residents immediately who may have leaks or other major problems.

Council Member Morzel agreed it was important to notify residents when there was a leak. She also agreed with Council Member Appelbaum that more stringent drought measures

were needed in a severe drought. She asked for numbers on how many people went into the blocks 4 and 5. Staff did track that number but didn't have the information on hand. Customers who entered block 5 were contacted as well as those who were consistently in blocks 4 and 5. Council Member Morzel was surprised not to see grey water addressed or discussed. Ned Williams responded that the state had a rain barrel harvesting pilot program being tested outside of municipalities. Staff was looking into how Boulder may help develop or support that type of initiative.

~~Council Member Ageton asked why staff wasn't including people who fail to maintain their systems in the enforcement section which is especially important during a drought situation. Mr. Williams noted that in the rules and regulations, staff was considering a fine for exceeding water budgets in a drought period. Section 11-25.5 (a) was the area that spoke to the violation.~~

Council Member Gray asked if water monitors were still available and what was the price. Staff responded that yes, water monitors were still available for \$75 and staff was considering allowing residents to check out water monitors with a refundable deposit in the future. A program like that would be useful during drought periods. Some cities with a high volume of vacationers also had a program that Council Member Gray suggested staff look at. She then asked about the build-out water demand in the City and how that would change with population growth. Staff responded that the build-out calculations were based on the Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan build-out conditions and the calculations had been done that way since 2002.

The public hearing was opened:

1. Henry E. Adamski, a 35 year resident of Boulder, didn't think there was anything to mitigate the impacts of a drought on the public. What it ensured was that the city had an uninterrupted flow of financial resources. He suggested that securing additional water resources or increasing storage was a better approach. New housing units in North Broadway and new development would all create a higher demand on water resources.

There being no further speakers the public hearing was closed.

Deputy Mayor Wilson moved, seconded by Karakehian to adopt Ordinance No. 7783 amending Chapters 11-1, "Water Utility," and 4-20-25, "Monthly Water User Charges," B.R.C. 1981, and setting forth related details. The motion carried unanimously 9:0.

6. **MATTERS FROM THE CITY MANAGER:**

A. **PRESENTATION AND REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PLANS TO UPDATE THE INTERIOR OF THE MUNICIPAL BUILDING TO IMPROVE CUSTOMER SERVICE, PUBLIC ACCESS, AND MEETING SPACES. – 8:50 P.M.**

City Manager Brautigam introduced the item noting the City had consolidated the Liquor licensing, medical marijuana, sales tax and miscellaneous licensing. These changes have created a need for realigning the first floor lobby area to provide a single location for the public to seek services. In addition, a lack of city meeting space could be addressed in this process. The City Council Chambers had not been updated since 1991 so replacing the seating and providing more flexibility for meeting space was included in the plan.

Lastly, an expansion of the second floor Fishbowl conference room and City Council office was included in the plan.

Glen Magee, Facilities Design and Construction Manager, provided the presentation on the item noting service to the public and enhanced meeting space were the primary goals. The four areas proposed for improvements were the first floor reception area, the first floor lobby and conference room, the second floor conference room and council office, and council chambers. He provided more detail about the specific changes and showed sketches of the what the areas would look like. The total projected costs were approximately \$316,000 and included a 10% contingency.

Council Member Gray asked about a new Council office and barrier in the Council Chambers. Mr. Magee clarified it would be an expansion of the existing office. A more permanent barrier in the Council Chambers leading onto the platform was not in the plan. She then asked if the beautiful flagstone on the east wall would be plastered over. Staff responded that no, security screens would be placed over the open windows and the flagstone would be captured through the lobby desk window.

Council Member Cowles raised concern about the noise and traffic in the lobby meeting space. He also spoke to the sound system noting better quality was needed to address volume issues. He also hoped for microphones that could be turned off and on. Staff was working with a consultant on the audio visual equipment.

Council Member Morzel agreed with Council Member Cowles and also suggested more thinking about how to keep the east flagstone wall in the lobby. She suggested changing the location of the main doors. She also asked if safety considerations had been discussed. Staff responded that safety was definitely taken into consideration.

Council Member Appelbaum raised concern about the flexible seating planned for council chambers and whether it was basically the same meeting space. Staff responded that the meeting space upstairs would provide even more flexibility and options and the downstairs lobby would remain the same size with a larger conference room.

Council Member Karakehian commented that he didn't want staff to spend more time designing or spend time on a new front door. He liked the plan as presented. He did not like meetings downstairs because the traffic passing through was disruptive. He did express concern about seat loss. He liked the idea of microphones that turn off and on for Council Members. He also suggested plug in devices at the desks to assist those who don't hear well. He also noted that HVAC issues weren't addressed in the plan and noted the Fishbowl conference room was often a sauna.

Council Member Ageton noted the design was good. She agreed with many of the shared comments and the concern about loss of seating. She did not want it to be uncomfortable for residents and have people sitting in the back. She did express that she hoped staff was thinking about how the changes would affect other areas and how that could be leveraged for maximum benefit.

Council Member Becker commented that she did not like the plan at all. Right now, meetings could occur in chambers and the lobby at the same time. She thought this wouldn't be possible anymore because dinners would take place upstairs and she didn't think the new conference room downstairs would be large enough. She felt this plan might lead to less waiting space on first floor that was often used as an overflow space.

She also liked traffic going through during meetings in the lobby as it provided more transparency. Council and Board meetings were getting bigger and this plan did not resolve that issue. The flexible space could look messy while providing less space and would be unattractive and uncomfortable. She did ask that the speaker areas be more wheel chair accessible. She agreed the microphones don't work well for users and that the front door issue was particularly frustrating.

Deputy Mayor Wilson asked about the downstairs door on the conference room suggesting it could be larger or glass could be added to make it more transparent and open.

City Manager Brautigam responded to some of the concerns raised commenting that the overflow space in the lobby would be about the same. People would not need to crowd into the conference room space. Staff was looking at placing closed circuit televisions downstairs in the conference room and in the open lobby space. Regarding the front door, she agreed it was frustrating and had heard the design was changed years ago due to flood concerns. Glen Magee also shared more history about the door placement.

Deputy Mayor Wilson asked whether the council chambers work would occur during the council recess. Staff confirmed that work would have to be done in phases to accommodate moving the licensing staff from the second floor to the second floor. Mr. Wilson suggested closed circuit cameras from downstairs to upstairs and back. He would like to see the plan move forward on a good schedule.

Mayor Osborne noted she appreciated the information about the budget and clarified that funding was from a standard fund set aside for this purpose specifically. She did not understand exactly how the moveable furniture would work. She would like staff to try and provide a location with flexible seating for council to go visit. She did express that she did not want the plan to be rushed.

Council Member Gray suggested she would like to see the door issue explored and she thought council's chairs were funky. She also suggested another led screen in the lobby.

Council Member Cowles spoke regarding the City Council office noting you really had to be in too close a quarters for meetings and sometimes got a bit trapped inside. He thought it was smart for staff to think of giving people more space in council chambers as well. He was okay losing some seating to give people more room. He thought it would be a mistake not to think about reconsidering the door location to utilize the sister city plaza. The audio and technical capabilities were disappointing. He thought the project was happening too fast and that the audio/visual equipment needs were critically important. He thought Council and Board Members who have needs for the Chamber should have the opportunity for feedback.

Council Member Morzel supported Council Member Becker and expressed that she disliked the first floor central reception area. She liked the upstairs plan but felt the downstairs was headed in the wrong direction.

City Manager Brautigam noted that the Council Chamber room was independent and could be worked on during Council's recess. The fishbowl conference room, council office and downstairs area would have to go together because the licensing staff office space had to move downstairs.

Council Member Ageton commented that Council had talked a lot about function, aesthetics and design but hadn't really discussed cost. She felt some of the ideas that had come forward would be much more costly and the City was already struggling to meet other needs in the community.

Council Member Appelbaum asked what was included in audio/video estimate. Glenn Magee noted it would probably cost another \$150,000 to get it where it needed to be. The Chamber upgrades under consideration were to create a software based system for the Chamber but did not include new microphones and other equipment upgrades. Council Member Appelbaum expressed that it would make more sense to make changes now rather than perform construction and upgrades and then down the road have to do it again. He expressed some concern about microphones that turn off and on as people may forget to turn them back on. He noted that in general the building just wasn't well designed. He was unhappy the stone wall in the lobby would be blocked because it was about the only worthwhile feature in the lobby.

Council Member Karakehian commented that he felt staff had done a nice job with the plan to better accommodate staff and serve the public. He didn't feel Council needed to redesign it. The constructive criticisms provided were helpful but he thought the discussion was frustrating.

Mayor Osborne commented that there was no vote required, just advice to staff.

Council Member Gray noted the most important issue for her was preserving the architectural features in lobby.

Deputy Mayor Wilson moved, seconded by Appelbaum to accept the plan giving the City Manager the ability to make changes that were suggested by Council that are within a reasonable budget and timeframe as the Manager chooses.

Mayor Osborne did a quick agenda check at 10:08 p.m.

B. UPDATE ON THE FOURMILE CANYON FIRE AND DOME FIRE BURN AREAS AND POTENTIAL CITY IMPACTS. (VERBAL UPDATE)- 10:11 P.M.

Ned Williams, Public Works Utilities Director, provided some additional information to Council about potential flood impacts from the burn areas. Many of the conclusions from the private consultants were intuitive, but the information on quantification of flood flows were very beneficial. The Boulder Creek and Fourmile Canyon Creek drainage areas were the two major areas of concern with a total of 74% of the burn area located in the land tributary to Boulder Creek and 18% of the burn area tributary to the Fourmile Canyon Creek area. The flood risks to Boulder and all modeling efforts had indicated a greater flood risk than in the pre-burn condition. Variables included whether a storm occurred, its intensity, and the duration. This increased flood risk could last from 2 to 10 years depending on how long the mitigation efforts took and how long the re-vegetation took.

Staff would continue to refine the estimates of the flood risks and keep the Council and public informed. Five messages would be going out to the public indicating that 1) the City and County were working together to provide personal safety and flood preparation information to the public; 2) There would be more flood warnings and activation of emergency sirens this year; 3) It was likely that there would be more flooding along the pedestrian underpasses along Boulder Creek. Flood insurance would be strongly

recommended for property owners along the floodplain areas. A 30-day wait period is required when purchasing flood insurance and those who already have insurance should review their coverage; 4) The creek would be murky and dirty this year if a storm occurred over the burn area. The fish and aquatic life were very adaptable and likely not be impacted; and 5) There is no threat to the City's drinking water supply as those areas are outside of the water supply source areas.

An information packet memo will be provided to Council in March or April and any additional information would also be provided to the public.

Deputy Mayor Wilson commented that the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District was supporting the City's efforts. He also encouraged the public to consider purchasing flood insurance.

Council Member Morzel noted that debris flows and landslides would also be a concern. She requested more information about those areas of concern.

C. UPDATE ON URBAN LAND INSTITUTE TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL FOR THE UNIVERSITY HILL COMMERCIAL AREA AND POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT. – 10:17 P.M.

Molly Winter, Director of the Downtown and University Hill Management Division/Parking Services, provided an update on the University Hill Commercial Area. A workshop with key stakeholders was held in July and key priorities were selected. The Hill Ownership group continues to meet to work on strategies for Hill revitalization. On April 27, 2010, Council and Planning Board agreed to pursue the exploration of 1) an innovative, creative district and 2) a high density residential and services maintenance district. On March 14 and 15, the Urban Land Institute would be presenting a two-day technical advisory panel. The first day would be primarily tours and stakeholder interviews and Council Members were welcome. The second day would be devoted to panel deliberations and recommendations. At the end of the second day, a public presentation would be held at Grace Lutheran. The Hill Ownership Group and the University Hill Management Commission would then review the recommendations before finally presenting to the Planning Board, City Council, CU and other groups.

Also under consideration was the concept of creating a taxing district just west of the commercial district to provide coordinated maintenance services. Trash removal, graffiti removal and snow removal were all services being considered. A working group that includes area property owners/managers were working to develop the scope of the project and will be soliciting feedback from the neighbors. Ms. Winter hoped to convene a larger group in April to move forward with this concept.

Deputy Mayor Wilson asked if the improvement district could be managed by owners (similar to downtown). Ms. Winter noted a number of options were presented and a business improvement district was an option, however no decision had been made regarding what kind of district would be best suited.

Deputy Mayor Wilson then asked if the group had considered a larger improvement district that would go into the lower density area (i.e. to hire extra police to manage traffic etc...) which some neighbors might be interested in. Ms. Winter commented that it was certainly a possibility. The group started by looking at where various issues were concentrated and services were needed and nothing would stop from expanding the

boundaries. In a general improvement district, neighborhoods could petition to become a part of the district.

Council Member Ageton moved, seconded by Morzel to suspend the rules and continue the meeting at 10:34 p.m. The motion carried unanimously 9:0.

Council Member Morzel thought the improvement district was a great idea and agreed with Deputy Mayor Wilson's comments. She requested a map showing what the zones were and asked what kind of report would come back to Council. Ms. Winter noted a full report would be provided to Council Members.

Council Member Becker commented that she had prepared some questions that she would pass along to Ms. Winter. She requested a copy of Ms. Winter's presentation and would like to be updated more frequently, primarily well in advance of large events happening. She thought it would have been helpful to be able to sit in on the deliberations and encouraged that some of the deliberations be open to the public. She also raised the topic of innovation districts and wanted the TAP to focus on (similar to Chicago and Boston) how underutilized areas could be better used and what the City's role would be in that. Ms. Winter noted comments on the problem statement and questions for the technical advisory panel would be welcomed by the end of the week so they could be incorporated.

7. **MATTERS FROM THE CITY ATTORNEY: - 10:44 p.m.**

None.

8. **MATTERS FROM MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:**

Council Member Morzel commented that Jefferson County would be continuing discussions with Boulder and other regional cities regarding the Jefferson Parkway.

Council Member Karakehian commented that the Dairy had opened its theater and highly recommended Council Members go check it out.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS: - 10:46 p.m.**

None.

10. **FINAL DECISIONS ON MATTERS: - 10:46 p.m.**

Council Member Cowles offered a friendly amendment to refer the design of the municipal building renovations to the Planning department and Downtown Design Advisory Board and allow the City Manager to decide what parts, if any, of the comments would be incorporated. The friendly amendment was NOT accepted by the maker of the motion.

Council Member Cowles moved, seconded by Morzel to amend the main motion by referring the design of the municipal building renovations to the Planning department and

Downtown Design Advisory Board and allow the City Manager to decide what parts, if any, of the comments would be incorporated. The motion failed 6:3; Becker, Cowles and Morzel in favor.

Vote was taken on the motion to accept the plan giving the City Manager the ability to make changes that were suggested by Council that are within a reasonable budget and timeframe as the manager chooses. The motion carried 6:3, Becker and Cowles opposed.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before Council at this time, BY MOTION REGULARLY ADOPTED, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:50 P.M.

APPROVED BY:



Susan Osborne,
Mayor

ATTEST:



Alisa D. Lewis,
City Clerk